

IN THE CLAIMS

---

22. (Amended) A pickup comprising:

an upper coil;

a lower coil; and

a single, uniformly completely flat non-magnetized ferromagnetic plate disposed between the upper coil and the lower coil.

---

REMARKS

This is a response to the Office Action mailed July 24, 2002. In that Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 22-24 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-23 of U.S. Patent Number 6,291,759; rejected claims 22-24 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-13 of U.S. Patent Number 6,291,785; rejected claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being met by either of Kinman '520 or Kinman '966; and rejected claims 22-24 under 35 U.S.C § 102(e) as being met by either of Kinman '999 or Blucher *et al.*

Terminal Disclaimers are provided herewith to obviate the Examiner's obviousness-type double patenting rejections with respect to U.S. Patent No. 6,291,758 and U.S. Patent No. 6,291,759.

In his rejection of claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being met by either of Kinman '520 or Kinman '966, the Examiner stated that each of these patents "discloses an upper coil 30, a lower coil 20 and a single, uniformly flat non-magnetized ferromagnetic plate 41 disposed between the two coils." However, Applicant respectfully submits that both Kinman '520 and Kinman '966 disclose a "shield 40 having a web 41 and opposed flanges 42, 43..." (column 5, lines 13, 15). It is important to note the Flanges 42, 43 extend upwardly and over sides of the coil 30' (column 5, lines 16, 17). These upwardly extending flanges 42, 43 are clearly shown in Figure 1 of both Kinman '520 and Kinman '966. Thus, the shield 40 of these two Kinman